

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 15, 16, 18, 19, 24-30, 35 and 36 have been amended. Claims 1-36 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claim Objections:

Claims 19, 24, 25, 28, 30, 35 and 36 have been amended to address the Examiner's objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments.

Section 112, Second Paragraph, Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 15-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. In regard to claim 15, the Examiner states that it is not clearly understood what the method is for. The Examiner also states that it is uncertain who is performing each of the actions recited in claim 15. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. In regard to method claims there is no requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, to recite within a claim the purpose of the method. Nor is there any requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, to identify a specific actor for each action of the method. The Examiner appears to be confusing breadth with indefiniteness. Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that "breadth of a claim is not to be equated with indefiniteness." M.P.E.P. § 2173.04; *In re Miller*, 441 F.2d 689, 169 USPQ 597 (CCPA 1971). Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph, rejection is respectfully requested.

Section 102(b) Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 12-20, 23-31 and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee (U.S. Publication 2002/0059348). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In regard to claim 1, Lee does not teach *a software documentation generator configured to input a plurality of sources related to a software program, wherein the plurality of sources comprises a plurality of different types of sources and comprises one or more of a software library documentation file and software program source code*. The input sources to Lee's documentation tool pertain to a hardware product design. Lee describes that the input sources come from hardware design tools. For example, at paragraph [0017], lines 6-11, Lee states:

For example, design tool 110i might be a Hardware Description Language (HDL) design tool that uses an HDL source file 114i for an integrated circuit design such as an Application Specific Integrated Circuit (ASIC). Examples of HDL design tools are tools based on Very High Speed Integrated Circuit Hardware Description Language (VHDL). (emphasis added).

As noted at paragraph [0017], lines 13-15, Lee's documentation tool itself is a software program, but the input sources to Lee's documentation tool pertain to a "hardware" product design, such as "for an integrated circuit design." Lee clearly does not teach *a software documentation generator configured to input a plurality of sources related to a software program*, as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, none of the input sources to the documentation tool described in Lee are *a software library documentation file or software program source code*. The Examiner refers to paragraph [0008], lines 1-4, of Lee. This portion of Lee is in the Background of the Invention section of Lee and pertains to the prior art documentation tools Javadoc and Perlpod. The functionality of these prior art tools does not apply to Lee's documentation tool. In fact, at paragraphs [0009] and [0010] Lee specifically describes the disadvantages of the prior art documentation tools and thus teaches away

from their use. Moreover, as noted in paragraph [0009] of Lee, these tools operate exclusively on a single type of input source. In contrast, Applicant's claim 1 requires that the software documentation generator operate on a plurality of different types of sources. Moreover, in a rejection under § 102, it is improper for the Examiner to combine teaching pertaining to different tools in a manner not described (and in fact taught away from) in the reference.

Further in regard to claim 1, Lee does not teach *a software documentation generator configured to aggregate the extracted information into a uniform format; and transform the aggregated information into one or more specified sets of software documentation for the software program*. In regard to these limitations, the Examiner cites paragraph [0033] and paragraph [0051], lines 1-4, of Lee. However, these portions of Lee only describe that Lee's documentation tool generates output files that may have different formats. These portions of Lee do not describe that the information extracted from the different types of input sources is aggregated into a uniform format. In fact, nowhere does Lee mention *aggregation into a uniform format*. Nor do the cited portions of Lee describe that Lee's output files are created by transforming the uniformly formatted aggregated information into one or more sets of software documentation for the software program. In fact, nowhere does Lee mention *transforming aggregated information having a uniform format*. Moreover, as noted above, the output files generated by Lee's documentation tool are documentation for a hardware product, not software documentation for a software program.

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. M.P.E.P 2131; *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The **identical invention must** be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). For numerous reasons, as shown above, Lee clearly fails to anticipate Applicant's claimed invention as recited in claim.

The arguments above apply similarly to the rejection of independent claims 15 and 26. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Section 103(a) Rejections:

The Examiner rejected claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Lorenz (U.S. Patent 6,405,366), claims 9-11 as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Lorenz and further in view of Stern (U.S. Patent 6,507,855), and claims 21, 22, 32 and 33 as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Stern. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the reasons stated above in regard to Lee.

In regard to the rejections under both sections 102 & 103, Applicants also assert that the rejection of numerous ones of the dependent claims is further unsupported by the teachings of the cited art. However, since the rejection of the independent claims has been shown to be unsupported and improper, a further discussion of the rejection of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-75900/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicant

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: February 14, 2008